

AS AMENDED

MINUTES OF TTF CG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on June 11, 2003. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724

Kathy Reilly M-NCPPC (301) 495-4555

Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609

Melanie Coffin OMB (240) 777-2763

Helen Xu DTS (240) 777-2804

STAFF

Margie Williams OCA (240) 777-3762

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700

Kamal Johari CTC (410) 964-5700

OTHER ATTENDEES

Bill O'Brien T-Mobile

Tom Carroll for AT&T Wireless

Steve Weber T-Mobile

Steven Hutchinson AT&T Wireless

M.G. Diamond for Verizon Wireless

Dan Magus Verizon Wireless

Brian Bolt Cingular Wireless

Discussion Item - Electronic Meetings: Jane Lawton asked the members if they were still comfortable with electronic meetings. All members agreed that electronic meetings were not a problem.

Consent Agenda:

1. Verizon Wireless application to replace 9 existing 52" panel antennas with 9 new 48" panel antennas at the same location and 100' elevation on the Sudbury House building located at 2100 Washington Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200305-02).
2. Verizon Wireless application to replace 9 existing 48" panel antennas with 9 new 48" panel antennas at the same location and 100' elevation on a 160' MDOT monopole located at I-495 & Connecticut Avenue in Kensington (Application #200305-03).
3. T-Mobile application to install 9 panel antennas at the 90' level of an existing monopole on the Leaman property located at 13820 Clopper Road in Boyds (Application #200305-04).
4. Verizon Wireless application to replace 9 existing 52" panel antennas with 9 new 48" panel antennas at the same location and 150' elevation on an existing 70' lattice tower mounted on the roof of the 87' Verizon Central Office building located at 8670 Georgia Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200305-05).
5. Verizon Wireless application to replace 9 existing 52" panel antennas with 9 new 48" panel antennas at the same location and 90' elevation on the 110' Silver Spring YMCA monopole located at 9800 Hastings Drive in Silver Spring (Application #200305-07).
6. T-Mobile application to install 6 new 48" panel antennas and a GPS antenna at the 72' level of a 75'

chimney on the Woodside Manor building located at 2114 Dexter Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200305-11).

7. T-Mobile application to install 3 new 56" panel antennas at the 67' level of the 120' Baptist Home monopole located at 6301 Greentree Road in Bethesda (Application #200305-12).

8. T-Mobile application to replace 3 of the existing antennas with 3 new antennas at the same 100' level of the 110' Silver Spring YMCA monopole located at 9800 Hastings Drive in Silver Spring (Application #200305-13).

9. Cingular application to replace 9 existing 24" antennas with 9 new 48" panel antennas at the same location and 99' elevation on a 130' ATC lattice tower located at 12419 Middlebrook Road in Germantown (Application #200305-14).

10. Cingular application to replace 9 existing 52" antennas with 9 new 48" antennas at the same location and 98' elevation on the Airpark Water Tank located at 20511 Woodfield Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200305-16).

11. AT&T Wireless application to install 6 new 74" antennas at the 118' level of the 130' Cabin John VFW monopole located at 11511 MacArthur Boulevard in Potomac (Application #200305-17).

12. AT&T Wireless application to install 6 new 74" antennas at the 140' level of a 150' monopole at Sherwood High School located at 300 Olney-Sandy Spring Road in Sandy Spring (Application #200305-18).

13. AT&T Wireless application to install 6 new 74" antennas at the 125' level of PEPCO transmission line tower #163-S located in the 1000 block of Ashton Road in Ashton (Application #200305-19).

Jane Lawton asked that Items 7, 11, 12, and 13 on the consent agenda be open for discussion. Kathy Reilly said she would like to comment on Items 3, 5, and 7.

Ms. Reilly said she believed that in cases where carriers are attaching additional antennas to existing structures permitted by Special Exception, they should file an administrative modification with the Board of Appeals to advise them that new antennas had been added to that facility. She stated that the Planning Board has recently had to review a number of very minor modifications for other kinds of facilities permitted by Special Exception, and she thought that changes to tower facilities would fall within the same category.

Jane Lawton asked the carriers at the meeting if they had been notifying the Board of Appeals of new attachments. All carriers present stated they had not. M.G. Diamond asked Ms. Reilly if a minor modification was required for something as simple as making changes to an air conditioning unit at a facility, for example. Ms. Reilly stated the Board had been reviewing modifications for changes as minor as changing a sign at a commercial facility. Ms. Lawton suggested that perhaps the group should send a letter to the Board of Appeals explaining the TTFCG's consent agenda items, and ask the Board if it believes that minor modifications are appropriate for additional attachments.

Tom Carroll stated the Board can already put conditions on a Special Exception to address concerns raised by interested parties during the public hearing. He said he believed that should be sufficient to cover attachment of additional antennas.

Bob Hunnicutt recalled that there was an opinion from the County Attorney regarding this matter, which was discussed at a TTFCG meeting during the review of another tower application several years ago. He said that the County Attorney had stated that any Special Exception conditions limiting the number of attachments to existing facilities were no longer valid because the 1996 Zoning Text Amendment to encourage co-location superceded such limits. Jane Lawton asked Mr. Hunnicutt to research the matter and report back to the group with his findings. Ms. Lawton suggested that, based on Mr. Hunnicutt's findings, she may also ask Marjorie Williams to contact other interested parties not in attendance at today's meeting, so they may provide any comments they may have regarding this matter, if necessary.

Jane Lawton asked Verizon to comment about the reason for its attachment of additional antennas to the facilities on the consent agenda.

M.G. Diamond explained that Verizon had been using the 800 MHz frequencies for their service, and were now

adding service at 1900 MHz, necessitating the use of dual-band antennas in place of the existing single-band antennas at their facilities. Dan Magus added that several years ago the FCC had granted most carriers the use of frequencies in the 1900 MHz bandwidth to provide new services. He said that because of changes in technology, T-Mobile needed to deploy new antennas to accommodate both the old and the new frequencies for their services.

Jane Lawton asked if the new frequencies were for the provision of broadband services. Mr. Magus agreed that was the case, and noted that essentially all of the carriers were providing this same kind of new digital service. Ms. Lawton asked Kamal Johari to explain what else was needed to provide these new services. Mr. Johari replied that new radios and additional equipment would need to be installed at the facilities as well. Ms. Lawton asked if the equipment would require additional ground space. Mr. Johari replied that might be necessary in some cases, but noted that for all of the applications being reviewed today, all additional equipment would be located in the existing shelters. Ms. Lawton asked T-Mobile to comment on its attachment of additional antennas to the facilities on the consent agenda.

Bill O'Brien explained that in all of the applications being reviewed today, the additional equipment would be located in the existing shelters.

For Item #7, Bob Hunnicutt explained that there had already been one modification to the Special Exception to increase the ground space to provide additional equipment shelters. He noted that the additional T-Mobile equipment would be located in another carrier's existing shelter. He added that since this was the sixth carrier to attach to this facility, he had asked for (and received) a structural analysis to verify that the monopole could support the weight of the additional antennas, cables, and "branches".

For Item #11, Tom Carroll verified that all of the additional AT&T Wireless equipment would be located within the existing shelter.

For Item #12, Pat Hanehan described the Board of Education review process, and noted that in this case, Calvin Nelson of the Planning Board had been working with the Board of Appeals and the carriers to attach to this facility. He stated that a letter from the Board of Education to the Planning Board would explain the addition of this carrier to this location.

Motion: Melanie Coffin moved recommendation of all the consent agenda items as recommended by the Tower Coordinator. Helen Xu seconded the motion, and it was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining on Items #11, 12, and 13.

Action Item: T-Mobile application to replace 6 existing 54" panel antennas with 6 new 72" panel antennas at the 193' and 180' levels of the Grosvenor House Apartment building located at 10101 Grosvenor Place in Rockville (Application #200305-06).

Action Item: Cingular application to install 2 additional 48" antennas to its existing array of six panel antennas at the same 173' level on the roof of the Grosvenor House Apartment building located at 10101 Grosvenor Place in Rockville (Application #200305-15).

Bob Hunnicutt explained that Cingular Wireless had provided an RF Emission Study with their application for this site to add additional antennas to the roof of this building. He noted that the study concluded that it was not a problem for Cingular to attach its antennas, but the report noted that another set of antennas (which happen to belong to T-Mobile and, coincidentally, are being reviewed at today's meeting) were of concern. The Study noted that T-Mobile's antennas could subject workers on the roof to harmful levels of RF emissions. Mr. Hunnicutt noted that although the FCC regulates RF emissions, since this issue had been of concern to the TTFCG, he wanted to bring it to their attention and also to the attention of T-Mobile. Jane Lawton asked Bill O'Brien to comment on this matter.

Mr. O'Brien stated that T-Mobile has always complied with all FCC regulations and would continue to do so in this case. He said that he would try to obtain a copy of the RF Emission Study from Cingular for review by T-Mobile engineers. Ms. Lawton asked Brian Bolt if he believed Cingular would be willing to provide a copy of the study to T-Mobile. Mr. Bolt stated he would check with Cingular but did not believe it would be a problem. Mr. Hunnicutt added that the issue was one of either restricting access to that area of the roof or posting a sign

warning of possible harmful effects from RF emissions. Ms. Lawton asked Mr. O'Brien to let the group know T-Mobile's final determination after it has reviewed the RF study. Mr. O'Brien agreed to do so.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved that both applications be recommended. Kathy Reilly seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Legislation Update: Marjorie Williams distributed copies of the final Executive Regulation covering TTF CG fees. Jane Lawton noted that the public comment period had expired and the fees would be effective as soon as it was signed by the County Executive the fees would be required. Melanie Coffin noted that any applications for review at the next meeting would be required to pay the fees.

Discussion Item - Application Requirements for Antenna Change-out: Bob Hunnicutt distributed copies of a letter from Verizon's representative, M.G. Diamond. He noted that in his letter, Mr. Diamond was suggesting that if applications were 1) a one-for-one exchange of old antennas for new antennas; 2) on an existing structure; and 3) had no change in the use of the ground space, a detailed architectural drawing of the site plan and elevation profile should not be required. Mr. Hunnicutt said he could agree that for just those specific instances, a less formal requirement would suffice for the Tower Coordinator's review purposes. He added that in lieu of an engineering or architectural plan, a simple sketch or photograph of the site could be provided with the application as documentation of what equipment was already there and what was proposed. He added that the requirements in the application process did necessitate some type of documentation to be on file.

Melanie Coffin said she too could agree that a full architectural set of plans need not be prepared, as long as there was also a clear statement in the application from the carrier that there would be no changes to the ground space, and that it was a one-for-one change-out of antennas.

Pat Hanehan stated that he agreed with Mr. Hunnicutt and Ms. Coffin, but that he was troubled about cases where there may not be more detailed existing plans on file with the Tower Coordinator. Mr. Hunnicutt commented that in most cases, the Tower Coordinator has detailed copies of site plans from the last carrier to attach to a site, but that would not be the case for sites that had never been reviewed by the TTF CG. He noted that if he had plans available, he could use those as reference in reviewing new applications for changes in equipment. Jane Lawton asked if he was referring to just those cases that pre-dated the TTF CG. Mr. Hunnicutt said he believed that was the case. Ms. Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator to draft a reply to Mr. Diamond's letter for the group to review and approve. She noted that the TTF CG gives CTC the authority to obtain site plans when they deem necessary. Mr. Hanehan stated he agreed it was necessary to have a plan submitted if there is not a sufficient plan on file. All members agreed with Mr. Hanehan.

Discussion Item - TTF CG Meeting Schedule: Bob Hunnicutt distributed copies of the July - December 2003 meeting schedule the group had previously approved. He noted that the meeting time had been changed from 10:00 a.m. back to 2:00 p.m. to accommodate members who wished to attend but had conflicts with the morning meeting time.

Discussion Item - PEPCO Attachment Policy Change for 500 KV Transmission Line Towers: Bob Hunnicutt explained that PEPCO had made a change to its policy regarding antenna attachments to 500 KV transmission line towers. He stated that he had been advised by a carrier that PEPCO had notified them that it would no longer permit attachment to 500 KV transmission line towers that require an outage to complete the attachment. Steven Weber from T-Mobile added that he was the one who advised Mr. Hunnicutt of the policy change when one of their applications pending Tower Coordinator review had to be withdrawn due to the policy change. He noted that T-Mobile was pursuing some other alternatives Mr. Hunnicutt had suggested in the general vicinity of the PEPCO transmission line tower.

Mr. Hunnicutt said that he had discussed the policy change with William Lopez at PEPCO who informed him that PEPCO could no longer continue to absorb the high cost of rerouting power to facilitate an outage for a cellular attachment to those high-power locations. He noted that Mr. Lopez stated that attachments to lesser capacity lines would continue to be considered as PEPCO receives requests.

Jane Lawton noted that the last time the TTF CG had been advised about this by PEPCO, it was their policy to only permit attachments during scheduled maintenance outages. She asked why PEPCO now changed its policy. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that Mr. Lopez also noted that there were so many requests of late that they could not keep up with them.

Ms. Lawton asked Mr. Hunnicutt to check again with PEPCO to verify what their present policy is, and to get a written copy of the policy, if possible. Ms. Coffin added that she would like Mr. Hunnicutt to determine the impact of the change by also asking PEPCO for the number of towers that fit that category.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, July 9, 2003 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room #225 of the COB.

\\Mc-Tower\Documents\Mtg Minutes\2003 Minutes\03June11.min.doc